UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,073	04/08/2004	Aurobinda Pradhan	13906-191001 / 2003P00966	9212

32864 7590 03/05/2007		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

F

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/821,073	PRADHAN, AUROBINDA
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 December 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114,

and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the

previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 12/08/2006 has been entered. Claims 1-20 are

presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
> therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because "a computer

program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier" is not limited to a

tangible embodiment since the specification described, "a computer program

product tangibly embodied in an **information carrier**, e.g., in a machine-

readable storage device or in a **propagated signal**" (page 10, lines 20-24 of

Specification). Therefore, claims 12-20 are non-statutory as not being tangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-3, and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Shuping</u> et al (US 6313855, issued Nov 6, 2001) and further in view of Anwar, US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0011990 A1.**

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 14, Shuping teaches a method to be performed in a computer system having stored therein an electronic document that is associated with another electronic document, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a selected electronic document on a graphical user interface, the selected document having one of several intrinsic associations with at least one other electronic document. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Abstract section). The current web page includes hyperlinks (several intrinsic associations) that correspond to future web pages (other electronic documents) (col. 8, lines 1-12).

Shuping does not expressly teach displaying on the graphical user interface while displaying the view of the selected electronic document, a user-selectable command that identifies the intrinsic association and causes a view of the other electronic document that is intrinsically associated with the selected electronic

document to be displayed on the graphical user interface. But one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have thought it was obvious based on Shuping's disclosure. Shuping discloses, in the method for web browsing, while the current page is displayed, the user selecting the "backward" navigation button on the tool bar of the browser, which navigates user through the past history of the web page. The past pages and current pages are associated by the history of the browser (col 1, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a backward navigation button on the tool bar of the browser which allowed for navigation to pages prior the current page as taught by Shuping, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

However, Shuping does not explicitly disclose indicating which of the selected electronic document and the other electronic document is a follow up of the other.

Anwar discloses a graphical user interface tool is presented wherein a document 100 includes links 102 (intrinsics) which may be associated with a floating thumbnail document 110 (other electronic document), and upon activating a control 112 (user-selectable command), those links within the document 100 may be associated with a floating thumbnail representative of a page view of the page associated with the respective link 102, thus the floating

thumbnail document is a follow up of the document 100 (page 7, paragraph [0053] and Fig. 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anwar and Shuping to include indicating which of the selected electronic document and the other electronic document is a follow up of the other for the purpose of allowing a user to manipulate and navigate through the digital representation of the document.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Shuping teaches the user-selectable command is displayed in response to a user selecting an input control in a toolbar of the graphical user interface. For example, the "backward" button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (col 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Shuping teaches wherein the selected electronic document is intrinsically associated with each of a plurality of other electronic document. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (Shuping, see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Shuping, Abstract section). The current web page is displayed in the second panel and identifies a hyperlink (which examiner interprets as a user selectable command to go to another linked page) in the current page to retrieve and render the future web page in a third panel, all embedded within a single window (Abstract section)

displaying on the graphical user interface a plurality of user-selectable commands for displaying views of the plurality of other documents, each of the plurality of user-selectable commands identifying the respective intrinsic association. For example, the "backward" button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Shuping teaches receiving a predetermined ... command. For example, the "backwards" button is a command on the tool bar which is existing before and provides user with functionality (col 1, lines 59-63). Shuping teaches in response to receiving ... one other electronic document. For example, upon user selecting the "backwards" command, displaying the past web pages prior to the current page (col 1, lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 10, Shuping teaches ceasing to display the view of the selected electronic document upon displaying at least one other electronic document. For example, in a conventional browser, upon the user selecting the "backward" button, the conventional browser stops displaying the "current" web page and moves on to display the immediately previous web page (col 2, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 11, Shuping does not expressly teach displaying another user-selectable command on the graphical user interface that identifies the intrinsic association and causes the view of the selected document to be displayed on the graphical user interface.

Anwar discloses upon activating the control 112 (user-selectable command), those links 102 (intrinsic associations) within the document 100 may be associated with a floating thumbnail representative of a page view of the page associated with the respective link 102 (page 7, paragraph [0053] and Fig. 9). In addition, thumbnail documents 114 may be representative of those documents that are associated with links 102 within document 100, or that are associated with other pages of the document 100 when that document 100 is a multi-page document (page 7, paragraph [0053]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anwar and Shuping to include displaying another user-selectable command on the graphical user interface that identifies the intrinsic association and causes the view of the selected document to be displayed on the graphical user interface for the purpose of allowing a user to manipulate and navigate through the digital representation of the document.

6.   **Claims 4-8 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Shuping</u> and Anwar as discussed in claims 1-3 and 9-16 above, and further in view of <u>Pirolli</u> et al (US 5895470, issued Apr 1999).**

Claim 4, Shuping in view of Anwar does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of a plurality of association categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for

documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Anwar to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Claim 5, Shuping in view of Anwar does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests grouping the plurality of user-selectable commands according to the plurality of association categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35). The examiner interprets links as equivalent to commands because a link is a user selected command to fetch the point to document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Claim 17, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests wherein the intrinsic associations between the selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belongs to any of a plurality of association categories, and wherein the plurality of user-selectable commands is grouped according to the plurality of association categories. For example, a

system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Anwar to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Shuping does not expressly teach the electronic documents forming a hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the past web page is equivalent to going to a parent page or one upward (or prior) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the future web page is equivalent to going to a child page or one down (or future) in time. This has the same logical relationship

as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) There would be no disclosure or suggestion of more than one intrinsic association.

In reply to argument A, Shuping discloses the current web page includes hyperlinks (several intrinsic associations) that correspond to future web pages (other electronic documents) (col. 8, lines 1-12).

B) The prior art does not teach the user-selectable command should identify the intrinsic association by indicating which of the electronic documents is a follow-up of the other.

In reply to argument B, Applicant's arguments with respect to "the user-selectable command should identify the intrinsic association by indicating which of the electronic documents is a follow-up of the other" have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection under Shuping in view of Anwar. Please see the rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100